

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság (Hungary) lodged on 6 March 2019 — TN v Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal

(Case C-210/19)

(2019/C 182/26)

Language of the case: Hungarian

Referring court

Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: TN

Defendant: Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal

Questions referred

1. Can Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Article 31 of Directive 2013/32/EU⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council (known as the 'Procedures Directive') be interpreted, in the light of Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights, as meaning that it is possible for effective judicial protection to be guaranteed in a Member State even if its courts cannot amend decisions given in asylum procedures but may only annul them and order that a new procedure be conducted?
2. Can Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Article 31 of Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council (known as the 'Procedures Directive') be interpreted, again in the light of Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights, as meaning that legislation of a Member State which lays down a single mandatory time limit of 60 days in total for judicial proceedings in asylum matters, irrespective of any individual circumstances and without regard to the particular features of the case or any potential difficulties in relation to evidence, is compatible with those provisions?

(¹) Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection (OJ 2013 L 180, p. 60).

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Cour de cassation (France) lodged on 12 March 2019 — XR v Coseil de l'ordre des avocats au barreau de Paris, Bâtonnier de l'ordre des avocats au barreau de Paris, Procureur général près la cour d'appel de Paris

(Case C-218/19)

(2019/C 182/27)

Language of the case: French

Referring court

Cour de cassation

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: XR

Defendants: Conseil de l'ordre des avocats au barreau de Paris, Bâtonnier de l'ordre des avocats au barreau de Paris, Procureur général près la cour d'appel de Paris

Questions referred

1. Does the principle that the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, now, after amendment, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, has created its own legal system, which is integrated into the legal systems of the Member States and which their courts are bound to apply, preclude national legislation which makes the grant of an exemption from the training and diploma requirements laid down, in principle, for entry to the profession of lawyer, dependent on the requirement of sufficient knowledge, on the part of the person requesting exemption, of national law of French origin, so that similar knowledge of the law of the European Union alone is not taken into account?
2. Do Articles 45 and 49 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union preclude national legislation which restricts an exemption from the training and diploma requirements laid down, in principle, for entry to the profession of lawyer, to certain members of the civil service of the same Member State who have performed legal work in that capacity, in France, in an administration or a public service or an international organisation, and which excludes from the scope of that exemption members or former members of the European civil service who have performed legal work in that capacity, in one or more fields of the law of the European Union, within the European Commission?

Request for a preliminary ruling from the Augstākā tiesa (Senāts) (Latvia) lodged on 20 March 2019 — A v Veselības ministrija

(Case C-243/19)

(2019/C 182/28)

Language of the case: Latvian

Referring court

Augstākā tiesa (Senāts)

Parties to the main proceedings

Applicant: A

Defendant: Veselības ministrija

Questions referred

1. Must Article 20(2) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, in conjunction with Article 21(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, be interpreted as meaning that a Member State may refuse to grant the authorisation referred to in Article 20(1) of that regulation where hospital care, the medical effectiveness of which is not contested, is available in the person's Member State of residence, even though the method of treatment used is contrary to that person's religious beliefs?